

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the thoroughness with which the Examiner has examined the above-identified application. Reconsideration is requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

In the Advisory Action dated November 15, 2004, the Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 2 and 10 over the cited prior art, but objected to these claims as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, namely, claims 1 and 9, respectively. Claims 2 and 10 recited that the unique computer identifier is selected from the group consisting of a BIOS serial number and a network adapter address.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 9 to incorporate the subject matter of claims 2 and 10, respectively, and has accordingly cancelled claims 2 and 10. Amended claims 1 and 9, and the claims dependent thereon (claims 3-8 and 11-12, respectively) are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 is directed to the installation of software on an end user computer having a damaged executable software program. Other than being directed specifically to correction of the damaged executable software program, claim 13 contains the same basic method steps to install licensed software as recited in claim 1. Dependent claim 14 includes the same subject matter as claims 2 and 10, namely that the unique computer identifier is selected from the group consisting of a BIOS serial number and a network adapter address. Since applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2 and 10 apply equally to claim 14, applicant has amended claim 13 to incorporate the subject matter of

claim 14 (and has accordingly cancelled claim 14). Applicant submits that amended claim 13 is in condition for allowance, along with dependent claims 15-17.

Claims 18, 19 and 20 are directed to a program storage device, a computer program product, and an article of manufacture, respectively. These claims recite either the same basic method steps to install licensed software as recited in claim 1 (claim 18), or computer readable program code means for executing those method steps (claim 19 and 20). Applicant has amended claims 18-20 in the same manner, i.e., to recite that the unique computer identifier is selected from the group consisting of a BIOS serial number and a network adapter address, and applicant believes that these claims are likewise in condition for allowance.

Consequently, applicant submits that remaining claims 1, 3-9, 11-13 and 15-20 of the application are in a condition where allowance of the case is proper. Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner not find the claims to be allowable, Applicants' attorney respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned to clarify any issue and/or to place the case in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter W. Peterson
Reg. No. 31,867

DeLIO & PETERSON, LLC
121 Whitney Avenue
New Haven, CT 06510-1241
(203) 787-0595
ibmf100268000amdf-af.doc